



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

WHY AMERICA HAS NOT SIX CARDINALS.

BY SALVATORE CORTESI.

MAY I be allowed to begin with a personal statement—that, during my long connection with American journalism and literary work, I have constantly supported the idea, endorsed even by prominent Protestants, that the Catholic Church has acquired in the United States such a position through its wonderful development in numbers, in the importance of its men and in the prestige and influence which it exercises in almost all the manifestations of the life of the country, especially in the education of the children, that only one Cardinal is an inadequate representation in the Sacred College for such an immense body of Catholics. In less than a century, the land of William Penn has become the fourth Catholic Power in the world from the point of view of numbers, being surpassed only by France, Austria and Italy, while it surpasses even these countries if we take into consideration the loyalty of the faithful, their generosity and their progressiveness. The Catholic Church in the United States, although remaining Roman, has a thoroughly American character of enterprise, of expansion and of grandeur, owing to the vastness of its institutions and the splendor of its buildings, which will soon rival in size and artistic beauty the historical cathedrals of the Old World, so that before long to the latter will only remain the superiority coming from centuries of tradition. Thus the balance will be maintained: the history in Europe; the vigor of modern genius in America.

If there were no figures to substantiate these affirmations they might seem exaggerations, but facts are undeniable. Let us take, for instance, New York, a diocese founded a century ago by the rescript of Pius VII appointing Father Luke Concannon, an Irish Dominican, as the first Bishop, who, however, never

reached his post, as he died suddenly after his consecration in Rome. Is it possible in our time to imagine New York's having, as its only Catholic Church, St. Peter's on Barclay Street? It was only in 1809 that the corner-stone was laid of St. Patrick's Cathedral on Mott Street, which cost one hundred thousand dollars, a sum then enormous, though it is a mere mite compared with the millions spent on the new cathedral of St. Patrick on Fifth Avenue, and on the over 300 churches which have since been erected in the archdiocese, besides about 200 chapels. New York is to-day the strongest Catholic city in the world, though Paris may have more people baptized into the Church, or there may be numerically more in Vienna; but neither Paris nor Vienna, nor Rome itself, can boast such a truly devout Catholic population at once so prosperous, so intelligent and so active. Besides being the metropolis of the western world, second only to London in population, New York, with its Catholics numbering about a million, almost as many as in the whole of England, and certainly more than in the whole of Australia, constitutes the most powerful centre the Papacy possesses in the Christian world. Statistics demonstrate that more than a million souls are added every year to the United States through immigration, three-fourths of whom are Catholics.

All this is more than sufficient to prove that the claims which for years have been put forward to have another American Cardinal are more than justified; but lately the Vatican authorities have been rather alarmed by the feeling which found expression in an article, published in *THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW*, demanding not one, but six Cardinals. Rome, therefore, prefers to demonstrate that the Catholic Church in the United States has no right to insist on the creation of American Cardinals. The supporters of the American demands set forth, as the strongest arguments in favor of their claims, that, firstly, the United States has now ceased to be a missionary country, having been removed from the jurisdiction of the Congregation of Propaganda, and is on the same footing as France, Austria, Italy and Spain; secondly, that the number of American Catholics may be safely estimated at 24,000,000, including, of course, those in the Philippines and Porto Rico; thirdly, that the contributions of Americans towards the Church are incomparably generous; and, fourthly, that the American prelates who are those pointed out as

worthy of the honor of the purple, are men of great distinction in churchmanship and otherwise.

The first argument has no special weight, for the reason that the whole of Latin America, which is entirely Catholic and has, therefore, never been a missionary country, had no Cardinal at all until the present Pope gave the Red Hat to Monsignor Cavalcanti, Archbishop of Rio Janeiro, in 1905—that is to say, thirty years after the United States had her first Prince of the Church, Archbishop McCloskey.

The second argument has not more weight in the eyes of the Holy See, since the creation of Cardinals is in no way proportioned to the Catholic population of the different countries. If it were so, as the United States had a Cardinal in 1875 when the Catholics there numbered about 5,000,000, Latin America should have had for several years nearly a dozen Cardinals—while, as we have seen, until 1905 she had none and now has only one. England not long ago, with less than a million faithful, had three Cardinals—Newman, Manning and Howard. If the arguments put forward with regard to America in connection with the number of Catholics had been then applied to the Catholic countries, France would have been entitled to over thirty Cardinals, Italy to twenty-five, Spain to eighteen, and so on. The same might be said about Australia or Canada, both of which had a Cardinal when their Catholic population had not yet reached one million. England, where also Catholicism, notwithstanding the unflinching opposition of Protestantism, has made such progress that in the last century the number of Catholics has risen in England and Wales alone from 60,000 to nearly 2,000,000 has been for six years, since the death of Cardinal Vaughn, without a single representative in the Sacred College, while instead there are three who are Irish or of Irish descent—Cardinal Logue, Archbishop of Armagh; Cardinal Moran, Archbishop of Sydney; and Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore. This disposes of the second argument.

The contributions of the American Catholics towards their Church at home and the Peter's Pence in Rome, besides direct offerings to the Pope, and until lately to propaganda, are certainly very considerable compared to those coming from other countries; but they will appear less so, if viewed in proportion to the riches of the United States and the less prosperous condition

of other parts of the world. There have been times, strange as it may now appear, in which France, then really acting as the eldest daughter of the Church, contributed to its clergy and to the Holy See more than all the other Catholic nations put together; but no one thought that this gave her a right to demand a larger number of Cardinals than she has had when her offerings became scarce. The United States have certainly also indirectly contributed to keep up the finances of the Vatican, since it was considered that, when the present Pope was raised to the Chair of St. Peter, the capital on the interest of which the Holy See had chiefly to depend, amounted to about \$6,000,000, besides the Peter's Pence, bringing something like \$500,000 yearly, and an average of \$100,000 coming from the different ecclesiastical congregations as fees for briefs, matrimonial dispensations, annulment of marriages, conferment of titles of nobility, etc. These revenues, put together, made a total income of \$800,000 a year, which, as Pius X said, after having introduced all possible economies, "are only sufficient for eight months of the year." For the other four months the Pope depended upon the direct offerings of the faithful, and the time is now long past when for about eight centuries each English family contributed annually one shilling towards the upkeep of the Holy See.

The settlement of the dispute about the land of the Friars in the Philippines, and of the other church questions in Cuba and Porto Rico, almost doubled the capital of the Vatican, so that their finances are now on a relatively solid basis; but such a transaction, which had, after all, a business character, cannot be taken as a reason for increasing the number of American Cardinals.

Finally, the last argument is, from the point of view of the Church dignitaries in Rome, the weakest of all. No one denies the great ability and learning of an ecclesiastic like Archbishop Farley, in the same way that it is impossible not to recognize the commanding influence and the universal respect which Archbishop Ireland enjoys among Catholics and Protestants alike, or the veneration called out by Archbishop Ryan of Philadelphia, the piety and administrative capacity of Archbishop Glennon of St. Louis, or the eloquence, tact and energy of Archbishop O'Connell of Boston; but these qualities, although they are generally among the coefficients required for the Cardinalate, are

not always sufficient, or even necessary, in order to secure entrance to the Sacred College. Many comparisons might be drawn between American and foreign prelates; but, besides being odious, they would be injudicious, as it would be impossible not to incur the suspicion of partiality. I will, therefore, give one example among the ecclesiastics of the United States. I do not think that there is any one acquainted with church history who does not admire the imposing figure of Monsignor John Hughes, the first Archbishop of New York, who, confessing, confirming, preaching, lecturing, ordaining, raising funds, building schools and colleges, founding charitable institutions, opening new churches, acting as apostle and as diplomatist, was one of the greatest personalities as man, as priest, as patriot. He was sent to Europe on a secret mission by President Lincoln to exercise his influence on the Pope and on the Catholic sovereigns in favor of the Northern States, as almost the whole of the old Continent, with the exception of the then small kingdom of Sardinia, sympathized with the Confederates. His services were extremely valuable, as through his strong individuality, convincing logic and attractive manners he succeeded in gaining over to his cause Pius IX and Louis Napoleon, thus preventing the Holy See and the French Empire first, and then the other European Powers, from recognizing the Confederate States as an independent nation. Still, Archbishop Hughes died without being created a Cardinal, and his successor, Archbishop McCloskey, although by general consent considered a less gifted man, received the Red Hat.

What I have said so far is merely to expound the considerations put forward by Rome in answer to the demands coming from America; but the real truth is that, according to Catholic doctrine, the Pope is the Vicar of Christ on earth; he represents divine authority; he is the intermediary between Heaven and the faithful; he fixes dogma; he is infallible because, interpreting Divinity, he cannot err; consequently, he cannot be subjected to control or receive advice as would befit a democratic chief. There is, therefore, no argument of any kind strong enough to influence the creation of the Cardinals, intrusted in an uncontrollable way to the will of the Pontiff, who is inspired by the Holy Ghost in choosing and creating the new wearers of the purple, as are the Cardinals when gathered in Conclave for the election of the Pope.

Still, this was not the origin of the Cardinals, it is rather in-

teresting to recall, for they were simple curates or titulars of the churches of Rome, which, being the principal places of worship, were called the "cardinals," a name which passed in time to those who served them. According to other writers, the word "*cardinalis*" was used to designate the fixed permanent clergy of any church, those who were so built into it, and necessary to its being, that it might be said to revolve round them, as a door round its pivot. The use of this metaphor dates from the most remote antiquity, so that, for instance, the five Princes of the Philistines were called "axles" or "hinges" of the people. While in the early days of the Church the Bishops were considered much more important than the Cardinals, the prestige of the latter grew when the right of electing the Pontiff was restricted to the members of the Sacred College alone, chiefly in order to prevent the terrible calamities which used to be the consequence of the great number of electors of the Head of the Church—which had caused thirty-two schisms. Nicolas II was the first Pope elected, in 1059, without any popular intervention, and it was he who published the Magna Charta which established the authority of the Sacred College, and decreed that the Pope should preferably be chosen from among the dignitaries of the Eternal City. With this, and with the choice of the Cardinals chiefly among the clergy of Rome, the Divine Selection of the ancient capital of the Latin world as the centre of Christendom was fulfilled. All the same, no one can affirm that the intentions of Nicolas II were carried out, as, after his death, sixty-nine years passed before a Roman sat in the Chair of St. Peter. Hadrian VI of Utrecht was the last foreign Pope and was so disliked by the Romans, because of his austerity and closeness with regard to money, that when he died, in 1523, the following inscription was found on his physician's door, "You are the savior of your country."

Sixtus V, with his famous Bull "*Postquam*" of 1585, prescribed the number of Cardinals which prevails to this day, ordering that they should never exceed seventy, thus composed: six of episcopal rank, holding the old Roman suburban sees; fifty described as priests, holding a corresponding number of titles or parishes in Rome; and fourteen described as deacons, corresponding to the fourteen "regions" into which the city was divided under Augustus. This again strengthened the opinion

that Pope and Cardinals, if not actually Romans and Italians, should at least reside in the Eternal City. The influences brought to bear on the Popes practically in all times for the augmentation of the number of Non-Italian Cardinals were many and most powerful, including strong pressure from kings and emperors, who thus obtained the privilege of nominating what was called the "Cardinals of the Crown." This privilege was enjoyed by the Emperor of Austria, the Kings of France, Spain, Poland and Portugal, and by the Republic of Venice. Clement XII granted it also, but only once, to James III of England, commonly called the "Old Pretender."

In 1458 the Sacred College implored Pius II not to augment the number of these "privileged" Cardinals and return to the wise habit of choosing Italian prelates, or at least ecclesiastics living in Rome, but the Pontiff did not accede to their request, saying that his honor did not allow him to neglect foreign countries. This view was ratified by the Council of Trent, which expressed the opinion that the Pope should choose the Cardinals, as far as possible, from the whole Christian world. Up to a century ago, one of the greatest objections to so doing was the difficulty of communication and the length of time required for the journey to Rome. There are, in fact, examples of dignitaries who were a long time without knowing that they had been created Cardinals, owing to the difficulty of transmitting the news to them. Indeed, William Macclesfield, the English Dominican professor at Oxford, was created Cardinal in 1303 by Benedict XI, when he was already dead in Louvain, this fact being still unknown in Rome. Another Englishman, William Petow, Bishop of Salisbury, Confessor of Queen Mary, was created Cardinal by Paul IV in 1557, but many believe that he never knew of his promotion, concealed from him by the Queen, because the pontifical brief announcing his exaltation also ordered that the Papal Legate, Cardinal Pole, should be replaced by Petow, which the Sovereign did not wish. Petow died ten months later without having ever worn the purple.

The difficulty of the distance is now almost entirely overcome; indeed, Pius X, in speaking last June to Archbishop Farley, remarked that, "New York, it may be said, is as near Rome as Naples." In fact, while Cardinal McCloskey, at the death of Pius IX, in coming to Rome—accompanied, it is interesting to

note, by the then young Father John Farley—arrived when Leo XIII had been already elected; at the death of the latter, Cardinal Gibbons reached Rome even before the first sitting of the Conclave, and the only member of the Sacred College who did not arrive in time was Cardinal Moran, Archbishop of Sydney. The constantly augmenting facilities for coming to Rome, even from the most distant parts of the globe, do not, however, alter the fact that by Divine Will Rome is the seat of the Catholic Church; in Rome evolves and revolves all the complicated machinery of its organization, and that is yet another reason why the greater number of Cardinals have been, are and must be Italian. When the headquarters of Catholicism were for nearly seventy years at Avignon, for the same reason the greater number of Cardinals were French. Should the prediction of Mr. Stead be fulfilled, and the Papacy to reconquer the empire of the world become Anglo-Saxon and transfer itself to America, then the greater number of Cardinals will be from the United States.

The preponderance of the Italian element in the Sacred College has not, however, prevented illustrious Cardinals of other countries from occupying prominent positions at the helm of the Church. To cite only the most recent examples, it will be sufficient to recall that Cardinal Ledochowski, a Pole, was for a lifetime Prefect of the Congregation of Propaganda under Leo XIII, being thus called the "Red Pope," as the head of that Congregation had then under his jurisdiction by far the larger part of the Catholic world; and Cardinal Merry del Val, a Spaniard, is, and very likely will remain throughout the pontificate of Pius X, his Secretary of State, the position which, if not hierarchically, is *de facto* the highest and most important of the Holy See.

This would not be complete without answering certain statements which might lead astray American readers not thoroughly acquainted with Roman affairs. It has been pointed out that an American Archbishop settled the Pious Fund controversy with Mexico at the Hague Tribunal; that an American Bishop went to Rome as a member of the Taft Commission, contributing to the result achieved; that another American Bishop acted as arbitrator in the great anthracite coal strike of 1902; and that another illustrious American prelate tried to prevent the Spanish-American war, without any of them being made Cardinal. Had these

ecclesiastics been Italians, it is added, they would have received the Red Hat, as happens when an Italian Bishop persuades the Prince of Monaco not to visit King Victor Emmanuel in Rome, or when another displays great heroism during the cholera epidemic. As the American examples will be generally recognized, it will undoubtedly be thought that the Italian examples also refer to prelates who have really been raised to the purple under the alleged circumstances. It will, therefore, be well to have it known that the Prince of Monaco was to come to Rome as a guest of the King last year, to which the Vatican objected, as, since the loss of the Temporal Power, the Popes have prohibited all Catholic sovereigns and rulers from visiting the King of Italy in his capital. The Prince of Monaco, alleging indisposition, abandoned the idea of going to the Eternal City, but no one has ever known that any prelate had any share in his decision, and even if it were so the asserted reward of the Red Hat has never been given, as, since that time, no Consistory has been held and no Cardinal created.

As to the cholera epidemic, the most important one was that in 1884 in Naples, when the deaths amounted to a thousand a day, and King Humbert and the Archbishop of the city met side by side to tend and comfort the dying, giving one of the most sublime examples of civic heroism. That Archbishop was Sanfelice di Acquavella, a Benedictine and a Cardinal; but the Red Hat had already been conferred upon him in the Consistory of March, 1884, several months before the cholera broke out. No other prelate, either then or on similar occasions, has entered the Sacred College for services rendered on the occasion of an epidemic. During the last earthquake disaster in Sicily and Calabria, few men distinguished themselves as did Monsignor d'Arrigo, Archbishop of Messina, or Monsignor Morabito, Bishop of Mileto, in the province of Reggio, but it has not been hinted that there is the least probability of their being rewarded for their labors with the supreme dignity of the Catholic hierarchy. It would be considered here almost the same as though it were said that all the naval and military officers who distinguished themselves there would be promoted admirals and generals. In conclusion, it would be absurd to expect that an institution, the central seat of which is so important as that of the Holy See, should not recruit the larger number of the members of its Senate from among Italians when Rome is its inevitable headquarters,

and there is no justifiable claim as to the appointment of Cardinals, either in Italy or elsewhere, while certain insistencies are only liable to produce the contrary effect. It is reported that the chances of certain American prelates to receive the much-coveted honor were spoiled by some of their too zealous friends, one of whom, for instance, an official of the Government, and, which aggravated his action, a Catholic, went to Rome and positively declared to the Vatican that, interpreting the desire of the then President of the United States, he would not leave the Eternal City until he had in his hands the Red Hat to carry himself to the American candidate, whose position, character and elevation of mind were worthy of a wiser advocate, and who might well have quoted the proverb, "From my enemies I can deliver myself, but may Providence protect me from my friends."

The Papacy, through traditions and conventions, has pledged herself to the appointment of certain Cardinals in Europe, but has no desire to commit herself to this inconvenient practice in new countries, and that is why a Cardinal in New York was followed by one in Baltimore.

It must finally be considered that, with the exception of a few Cardinals intrusted in Rome with certain important offices like the Secretaryship of State, the Prefecture of Propaganda, the six suburban episcopal sees, the Chancellorship of the Church, etc., most of the other Cardinals, beyond being electors in the case of the vacant pontifical see, are much less important in power, prestige, influence and economic position than several Archbishops and some Bishops of the United States. While the Cardinalate would practically add nothing, except the satisfaction of some ambitious feeling, to some powerful Archbishops, like those of New York and Chicago, what the United States really needs is a Cardinal of theirs residing in Rome to interpret American opinions, methods and aims to the head of the Church. Of course if any of the American Archbishops were ordered to such a post, their admirable sense of duty and unflinching spirit of discipline would lead them to accept it, but no one of them would willingly leave their position in America to become a secondary member of the Sacred College in Rome. There could be no better demonstration of the superiority of an American Archbishop to an ordinary wearer of the purple in the Eternal City.

SALVATORE CORTESI.